

Question 2: Can you tell me if all of this work will involve nuclear cleanup?

Answer: See Section C - Description/Specifications, Performance Work Statement (PWS) Section for a complete description of the services required, including the types of contamination. However, the sites and/or facilities undergoing Environmental Remediation or Deactivation, Decommissioning, Demolition, and Removal Services (DD&R) will contain to varying degrees, radioactive and/or hazardous and/or chemical substances, as described in the PWS, Section C. See also Section C.10.3 regarding Waste Management services for waste types anticipated.

Question 3: Can we assume that the set-aside for SB's "will not" be performing radiological work; only non radiological as applied to the Performance Work Statement?

Answer: No, please see answer above. The sites and/or facilities will contain radioactive and/or hazardous and/or chemical substances to varying degrees. The services required under this solicitation include "environmental remediation; deactivation, decommissioning, demolition, and removal of facilities (contaminated), including accelerator facilities; regulatory services and support; waste management and transportation; and all associated activities to ensure safe and efficient performance of these services. Sites and facilities may be contaminated with radioactive, hazardous, and/or chemical substances. Radiological constituents may include, but are not limited to: mixed fission products, activation products (e.g., cobalt-60), uranium, depleted uranium, radioactive sources, residual radioactive material (e.g., mill tailings), tritium, and small quantities of fissile and fissionable materials." Section C.10.

Question 4: In Section L we request lowering relevant projects values for small businesses from:

- "...values ranging from \$5 to \$100M..." to "...values in excess of \$2M...".

Discussion: The high dollar minimum for projects to be listed in this section, eliminates D&D and RA projects that are in the \$1.5 to \$2.5 M range that fully demonstrates the seller's capability for the attributes required to be addressed in SOW and reduces the complexity of project organizational charts adding multiple team members to address these items. In any case, the buyer can grade and evaluate the strength of the projects that seller submits.

Answer: Section L.31 (1) and (4), NOTE -- Initially, the dollar range specified is not a minimum dollar value that offerors must have performed. However, the values specified are representative of the anticipated value of the task orders to be issued under this solicitation/contract. Therefore, DOE included the Note in Section L.31(1) to assist offerors in preparing proposals regarding the size (value and duration) that DOE would consider similar in size in evaluating experience and past performance. Size will not be the only consideration in evaluating relevancy. DOE will also consider the similarity of the scope and complexity of the work in the contracts and information provided by offerors, in addition to size, in evaluating relevancy. The solicitation will be amended to clarify that the Note in Section L.31 (1) and (4) and Section M.6(1) and (4) pertains to what DOE considers to be similar in size and delete the word "relevant." Evaluation of relevancy will be based upon an evaluation of size, scope, and complexity.

Question 5: In Section L: request reduction of duration from:

- "...durations of 2 to 4 years..." to "...durations greater than (>) one year..." as relevant for small businesses.

Note: This means (combined with previous question) that a two million project performed over a >one year time frame is relevant.

Discussion: Small businesses typically have small projects that range from 1-3 years. A one year minimum is more in line with small business projects rather than the 2 to 4 year period.

DE-SOL-0000524
Questions & Answers 2-5
Posted 8/28/2009

Answer: Section L.31 (1) and (4), NOTE -- Initially, the durations specified are not minimum durations that offerors must have performed. However, the durations specified are representative of the anticipated duration of the task orders to be issued under this solicitation/contract. Therefore, DOE included the Note in Section L.31(1) to assist offerors in preparing proposals regarding the size (value and duration) that DOE would consider similar in size in evaluating experience and past performance. Size will not be the only consideration in evaluating relevancy. DOE will also consider the similarity of the scope and complexity of the work in the contracts and information provided by offerors, in addition to size, in evaluating relevancy. The solicitation will be amended to clarify that the Note in Section L.31 (1) and (4) and Section M.6(1) and (4) pertains to what DOE considers to be similar in size and delete the word "relevant." Evaluation of relevancy will be based upon an evaluation of size, scope, and complexity.